

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

DEMETRIUS MONROE BOYD,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 15-cv-832

LT. SHANNAN-SHARPE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On September 22, 2015, plaintiff filed a “Motion for District Judge.” (Docket #22.) While it is not stated in the body of plaintiff’s motion, I conclude from the title of the motion that plaintiff would prefer that a district judge, as opposed to a magistrate judge, be assigned to his case. I deny plaintiff’s motion because I am a district judge, not a magistrate judge.

Additionally, plaintiff has not identified a valid basis to support a request that I recuse myself from this case. Plaintiff states only that my decisions in other cases he has filed “appear to be found upon other out of court grounds whether it be personal, racial or both. . . .” (Docket #22 at 2.) “[I]nferences drawn from prior judicial determinations are insufficient grounds for recusal because it is the duty of the judge to rule upon issues of fact and law and questions of conduct which happen to form a part of the proceedings before him.” U.S. v. Jeffers, 532 F.2d 1101, 1112 (7th Cir. 1976), rev’d in part on other grounds, 432 U.S. 1977 (1977) (citations omitted). In other words, assuming a personal bias based on prior judicial actions, overlooks “the basic presumption that a judge approaches each new case with impartiality and conducts the case on its own merits from

the evidence there presented quite apart from any other case he might have heard.” Id. Plaintiff bases his request for my recusal solely on adverse decisions I have made in other cases he has filed, and this alone is fatal to his request. See also U.S. v. Barnes, 909 F.2d 1059, 1072 (7th Cir. 1990) (“Allegations of bias stemming from present and past cases in which the judge and the moving party were involved are not proper grounds for recusal.”).

Finally, I remind plaintiff that each of his cases stands on its own, and I will not address in this case my decisions in other cases he has filed. If plaintiff has particular issues he would like to raise about my decisions, he must raise them in the relevant case.

THEREFORE, IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for district judge (Docket #22) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 25th day of September, 2015.

s/ Lynn Adelman

LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge